

### **REMARKS**

Claims 24-49 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated May 11, 2010, claims 24-49 were rejected.

Claims 24 and 38 are amended.

Claims 24-49 are pending upon entry of the amendment.

In view of the amendments herein and the remarks that follow, reconsideration of all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdrawal of them, is now requested.

### **Summary of Interview**

Examiner Refai held a telephone interview on July 21, 2010 with Applicants' representatives Jennifer R. Bush and Carlo Miguel C. Ocampo. During the Interview, Applicants' representatives and the Examiner discussed the § 102 rejection. During the Interview, the Examiner admitted that he failed to address in the Office Action the feature of "a mapping table" that "maps each event of the one or more types of site data equipment...to a corresponding event handler that executes in response to an event generated by the one or more types of data source equipment," as previously recited in the claim. No agreement was reached. The details of the Interview are discussed below.

### **Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In the Office Action, claims 24-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas, U.S. Patent No. 7,366,522. This rejection is traversed.

As an initial matter, during the Interview, the Examiner admitted that the feature reciting a "mapping table" that maps each event "to a corresponding event handler that executes in response to an event generated by the one or more types of data source

equipment” was not addressed in the Office Action. Per MPEP 706.07(a) any second or subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicant’s amendment of the claims nor based on the information submitted in an information disclosure statement. Any subsequent Office Action cannot be made final because the mapping of the “one or more types of data source equipment” to an “event handler” feature was not addressed by the Examiner in the current Office Action. Thus, the recited feature will be addressed for the first time in any subsequent Office Action.

Amended<sup>1</sup> claim 24 recites a system in a supply chain network, the system comprising:

- one or more site data appliances comprising one or more types of data source equipment, the one or more site data appliances using a protocol to collect specification information from the one or more types of data source equipment, the specification information comprising event information that describes events generated by the one or more types of data source equipment;
- one or more site servers coupled to one or more site data appliances that receive the specification information from the one or more site data appliances and generate a document describing the event information of the one or more types of data source equipment; and
- a data center coupled to the one or more site servers that receives the document from the one or more site servers and automatically generates a mapping table based on the received document that maps each event of the one or more types of data source equipment as described in the event information to a corresponding event handler that executes in response to an event generated by the one or more types of data source equipment.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by Thomas. Thomas does not disclose a data center that “automatically generates a mapping table...that maps each event of the one or more types of data source equipment...to a corresponding

---

<sup>1</sup> Claim 1 has been amended to address the § 112 ¶ 2 issue as discussed during the Interview.

event handler that executes in response to an event generated by the one or more types of data source equipment.”

Thomas discloses generating a location page based on location information stored in a location data database illustrated in Figure 5B. *See* col. 7, ll. 12-15. Thomas states that the location page “represents the formatting of the location information into a suitable format, such as a document, that can be delivered to the requesting viewer.” *See* col. 7, ll. 15-18. In the rejection of claim 24, the Examiner asserts that Thomas’ location page could be a corollary to the claimed “mapping table.” However, Thomas’ location page lacks the features of the “mapping table,” as claimed.

As mentioned above, the basis of Thomas’ location page is location information stored in the location database. Figure 5B reproduced below illustrates the basis for Thomas’ mapping table.

MD	CURRENT LOCATION	PREVIOUS LOCATION
1	XXX	YYY
2	WWW	ZZZ

FIG. 5B

As shown above, the location information merely maps a mobile device to its current and previous location. For example, MD (mobile device) 1 is currently at location XXX whereas it was previously located at location YYY. Clearly, the section cited by the Examiner fails to disclose that the location page maps a location (i.e., an event) of the mobile device (i.e., data source equipment) to a corresponding event handler, as claimed. The location page merely maps a location to a mobile device.

Thus, for at least the reasons noted above, claim 24 is patentably distinguishable over Thomas.

Furthermore, during the Interview the Examiner asserted that the recitation of mapping each event of the one or more types of data source equipment to a corresponding event handler “that executes in response to an event generated by the one or more types of data source equipment” describes intended use of the claimed invention. Thus, the Examiner argued that the feature would not be given any patentable weight.

However, per MPEP 2106, intended use is “[l]anguage that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.” Here, the recitation of mapping of a data source equipment to an event handler “that executes in response to an event generated” by the data source equipment neither suggests nor makes optional the execution of the event handler. The recited feature is a positive limitation that requires the execution of the event handler in response to a generated event by the data source equipment. Thus, claim 1 does not recite intended use language as asserted by the Examiner.

The Office Action rejected claims 31, 38-39, and 46 for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 24 with respect to Thomas. *See* Office Action, p. 4. Claims 31, 38-39, and 46 include similar limitations as those of claim 24. Thus, claims 31, 38-39, and 46 are patentably distinguishable over Thomas for similar reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31.

Dependent claims 25-30, 32-37, 40-45, and 47-49 incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims. Applicants submit that claims 25-30, 32-37, 40-45, and 47-49 are

allowable for at least the reasons described above with respect to the independent claims in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

For example, Thomas does not disclose “wherein communications between the one or more types of data equipment, the one or more site data appliances and the one or more site servers utilize a Universal Data Appliance Protocol (UDAP),” as recited in claim 30. In the rejection of claim 30, the Examiner asserts that the recited feature is shown by column 7 and lines 15 through 20 of Thomas which is reproduced below.

retrieved information can be formed 612. Here, the location 15  
page represents the formatting of the location information  
into a suitable format, such as a document, that can be  
delivered to the requesting viewer. As an example, the  
location page can be a marked-up language document such  
as HTML, XML, HDML, or other markup language. The 20

As shown above, the section cited by the Examiner indicates that a location page can be a marked-up language document such as HTML, XML, HDML, or other markup language. First, the markup languages cited by Thomas merely describe the format of the location page that is presented to a requesting user. The markup languages described by Thomas are not used for “communications between the one or more types of data source equipment, the one or more side data appliances and the one or more site servers,” as claimed.

Second, the markup languages do not correspond to the claimed “UDAP.” Although the Examiner is to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, the interpretation must be “consistent with the specification.” See MPEP 2164.08. Per MPEP 2111.02, Applicants are entitled to be his or her own lexicographer. The Examiner is invited to review paragraphs 29 through 49 of Applicants’ specification for the correct interpretation of the term “UDAP.”

Thus, for at least the reasons described above, claim 30 is patentable over Thomas.

**Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-49 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: August 9, 2010

By: /Carlo Miguel C. Ocampo/  
Carlo Miguel C. Ocampo, Reg. No. 65,328  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7820  
Fax: (650) 938-5200